

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claim 1 is amended to clarify the claimed structure. No new matter is added and it is submitted that the clarifications do not require additional searching, but merely provide an even more succinct description the claimed subject matter consistent with that previously argued by Applicants in connection with the claimed subject matter.

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 2,252,656 (Miller et al.).

All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, in response to the Examiner's comment about giving the claims "their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the support in the disclosure," it is respectfully noted that the Examiner does not have an unfettered license to interpret claims to embrace anything remotely related to the claimed invention. Rather, claims should always be read in light of the specification and teachings in the underlying patent. See *Schriber-Schroth Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co.*, 311 U.S. 211, 217, 61 S.Ct. 235, 85 L.Ed. 132 (1940) ("The claims of a patent are always to be read or interpreted in light of its specifications.")" (*In re Suitco Surface, Inc.*, 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)).

In this case, it is submitted that rejection is premised on an unreasonable claim construction and a strained reference interpretation that is inconsistent with the reach of the claimed subject matter when given its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification as it would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.. As such, the rejection is in error. *See, Ex parte Ma et al.*, Appeal No. 2010-3794 (BPAI)).

Nonetheless, in an effort to reach common ground, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify the claimed structure. That is, while it is submitted that the claim has changed very little in essence, additional structural limitations have been added to eliminate the possibility of the overly broad construction adopted by the Examiner.

In regards to the amendments to claim 1, it will be appreciated that, as amended, claim 1 requires that the umbilical has a proximal end extending from the control body and distal end at the opposite end. Claim 1 further requires that the angulation cable is movable by the angulation

control. Thus, the umbilical cannot be the angulation cable of the cited reference as asserted by the Examiner, as this cannot be moved by the angulation control.

In this regard, to further emphasize that the angulation cable cannot be the umbilical, claim 1 requires that the angulation cable extend down within the umbilical. Claim 1 also requires that the umbilical is releasably attached at its distal end to the main unit and that the motor is within the distal end. To the contrary, with reference to Miller et al., it will be appreciated that the distal end of the umbilical is releasably attached to the main unit (represented by connector 14). Accordingly, the motor 45 of Miller et al. cannot possibly be said to be within the distal end of the umbilical, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-7, is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested. In the event this response is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper be charged to our **Deposit Account No. 12-2355**.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:

Robert O. Fox

Registration No. 34,165

October 12, 2011  
P. O. Box 1871  
Knoxville, TN 37901  
Phone (865) 546-4305  
Fax (865) 523-4478  
Email: RFOX@LNG-PATENT.COM